

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hose (US 7,024,205 B1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hose discloses providing subscriber delivered and personalized location-based services. In one embodiment, the invention is implemented in an intelligent wireless network (100). A subscriber initiates the location-based service process by entering a service request using a wireless telephone (102). The request is transmitted to an intelligent network platform (112) via cell site equipment (108) and MSC (110). An application implementing the process that runs on the platform (112) receives subscriber profile information (114), location finding equipment inputs (116) and service information (118) related to the service request. Based on these inputs, the application selects location-based service data that is transmitted to the telephone (102) via a data server (120), the MSC (110) and the cell site equipment. (Hose, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Hose fails to disclose "at least one of said tangible first and second type tags has means for identifying combinations of tangible first and second type tags brought into close proximity of each other and communicate information relating to these tangible tags to the administrative system", as recited in independent claim 11 and "providing at least one of said tangible first and second type tags with means for identifying combinations of tangible first and second type tags brought into close proximity of each other and means for communicating information relating to these tangible tags to the administrative system" as recited in independent claim 16.

The present invention discloses, in one embodiment, providing at least one first type tag and a second type tag identifying a media access point. When the first and second tags are brought into close proximity of each other, information relating to the tags is communicated to an administrative system.

In contrast Hose teaches determining the location of a device using an LFE or an external source such as a GPS system. Then, when the user requests location based

services, providing services based on the determined location. Since Hose suggests that an LFE or an external system such as a GPS system may be used to find the user location, Hose teaches away from the solution of the present invention where the relevant location information only comprises the position of the first type tag relative to the position of the second type tag.

Therefore, independent claims 11 and 16 are patentable over the cited art. Claims 12-15 and 17-20 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims. The allowance of claims 11-20 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Registration No. 53,987

Date: December 7, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com